1 2	Jeremy J. Thompson, Esq. (12503) CLARK HILL PLC 3800 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 500				
3	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Tel. 702.697.7527 Fax 702.862.8400 jthompson@clarkhill.com				
4					
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff Strike 3 Holdings, LLC				
6					
7					
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	DISTRICT OF NEVADA				
10	STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC,	Case Number: 2:19-cv-01072-JAD-VCF			
11	Plaintiff, STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC'S				
12	vs.	AMENDED EX-PARTE APPLICATION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN			
13	JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address 68.224.153.164,  Defendant.  WHICH TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE ON JOHN DOE DEFENDANT				
14					
15					
16					
17	Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m), Plaintiff, Strike 3 Holdings, LLC ("Plaintiff"), makes				
18	this amended <i>ex-parte</i> application for entry of an order extending the time within which to				
19	effectuate service on John Doe Defendant, and states:				
20	1. This is a copyright infringement case against a John Doe Defendant known to				
21	Plaintiff only by an IP address. Defendant's true identity is known by their Internet service				
22	provider ("ISP").				
23	2. On July 22, 2019, Plaintiff filed	its Ex-Parte Motion for Leave to Serve			
24	Subpoena ("Motion"), which would allow it to identify Defendant. ECF 4. Without the				
25	Internet Service Provider's ("ISP") response to this subpoena, Plaintiff cannot identify and				
26	serve Defendant.				
27					
28		1			

- 3. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 4(m), Plaintiff is required to effectuate service on the Defendant no later than September 22, 2019. After a review of this case in PACER and not seeing a docket entry subsequent to its Motion, Plaintiff believed that the Court had yet to rule on its Motion. As a result, it filed its original *Ex-Parte* Application for Extension of Time within Which to Effectuate Service on John Doe Defendant on September 18, which noted that it had not yet received a Court order granting its Motion, and thus had not issued a subpoena seeking the Defendant's identity.
- 4. In a separate matter where Plaintiff had made a similar request for extension of time, the Court pointed out that it had issued an order in that case. *See* Case No. CV 19 -01071-JCM-NJK, ECF No. 7.
- 5. Upon receiving the ECF No. 7 email notification related to that separate matter, Plaintiff's counsel reviewed PACER in this case and noticed that its application for an extension of time was identified as ECF No. 6, but that there was no docket entry or information for ECF No. 5. *See* Exhibit 1.
- 6. Thus, it recently came to Plaintiff's attention that the Court had already entered an order granting Plaintiff's Motion in this case, but that such order has not posted on PACER. After careful review of undersigned's email, however, undersigned found the CM/ECF email notification indicating that the Court had entered an Order granting the Motion at Docket Entry 5 ("Order"). Plaintiff is filing the instant amended motion to correct its previous statement that its Motion had not been granted.
- 7. In learning of this discrepancy, Plaintiff also discovered that the CM/ECF notification email did not provide Plaintiff with access to the Order. That is, Plaintiff is unable to review and download the Order to attach to its subpoena to the ISP.
- 8. Plaintiff apologizes to this Court for this confusion and oversight and will ensure that it notifies the clerk as soon as possible of any future CM/ECF notification emails which do not provide access to a filed document.

- 9. Plaintiff respectfully requests that the time within which it has to effect service of the summons and Complaint on Defendant be extended until forty-five (45) days after it expects to learn the Defendant's identity, or November 15, 2019. This extension should allow Plaintiff sufficient time to request that the clerk make the Order publicly available on the docket, serve the subpoena, receive the ISP's response, conduct a further investigation to assist in determining whether the individual identified by the ISP is the appropriate defendant for this action, amend the complaint and serve the appropriate defendant.
  - 10. This application is made in good faith and not for the purpose of undue delay.
  - 11. None of the parties will be prejudiced by the granting of this extension.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the time within which it has to effectuate service of the summons and Complaint on Defendant be extended until November 15, 2019. A proposed order is attached for the Court's convenience.

Dated this 2nd day of October, 2019.

### **CLARK HILL PLC**

By: /s/ Jeremy J. Thompson
Jeremy J. Thompson, Esq. (12503)

Attorney for Plaintiff Strike 3 Holdings, LLC

# **EXHIBIT 1**

## **United States District Court** District of Nevada (Las Vegas) CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:19-cv-01072-JAD-VCF

Strike 3 Holdings, LLC v. Doe Assigned to: Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey

Referred to: Magistrate Judge Cam Ferenbach

Demand: \$150,000

Cause: 17:101 Copyright Infringement

**Plaintiff** 

Strike 3 Holdings, LLC

Date Filed: 06/21/2019 Jury Demand: Plaintiff

Nature of Suit: 820 Copyright Jurisdiction: Federal Question

represented by **Jeremy J. Thompson** 

Clark Hill PLLC

3800 Howard Hughes Parkway

Suite 500

Las Vegas, NV 89169 702-862-8300 Fax: 702-862-8400

Email: <u>ithompson@clarkhill.com</u> ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

### **Defendant**

### John Doe

Date Filed	#	Docket Text	
06/21/2019	1	COMPLAINT against All Defendants (Filing fee \$400 receipt number 0978–5597907) by Strike 3 Holdings, LLC. Proof of service due by 9/19/2019. (Attachments: # 1 Civil Cover Sheet, # 2 Exhibit A to Complaint)(Thompson, Jeremy)	
		NOTICE of Certificate of Interested Parties requirement: Under Local Rule 7.1–1, a party must <u>immediately</u> file its disclosure statement with its first appearance, pleading, petition, motion, response, or other request addressed to the court. (Entered: 06/21/2019)	
06/21/2019	06/21/2019  2 CERTIFICATE of Interested Parties by Strike 3 Holdings, LLC that identifi parties that have an interest in the outcome of this case. Corporate Parent Ge Media Systems, LLC for Strike 3 Holdings, LLC added. (Thompson, Jeremy (Entered: 06/21/2019)		
06/21/2019		Case randomly assigned to Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey and Magistrate Judge Cam Ferenbach. (JM) (Entered: 06/21/2019)	
06/21/2019	<u>3</u>	AO 121 – REPORT on the filing or determination of an action or appeal regarding a copyright. Mailed to the Register of Copyrights, Copyright Office. (JM) (Entered: 06/21/2019)	
07/22/2019	4	EX PARTE MOTION for Leave to Serve Third Party Subpoena Prior to Rule 26(f) Conference by Plaintiff Strike 3 Holdings, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Declaration Fieser, # 2 Declaration Lansky, # 3 Declaration Pasquale, # 4 Declaration Stalzer, # 5 Proposed Order) (Thompson, Jeremy) (Entered: 07/22/2019)	
09/18/2019	<u>6</u>	First EX PARTE MOTION for Extension of Time within Which to Effectuate Service on John Doe Defendant re 4 Ex Parte Motion, by Plaintiff Strike 3 Holdings, LLC. (Attachments: # 1 Proposed Order on Plaintiff's Ex-Parte Application for Extension of Time within which to Effectuate Service on John Doe Defendant) (Thompson, Jeremy) (Entered: 09/18/2019)	

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC,	Case Number: 2:19-cv-01072-JAD-VCF	
Plaintiff,		
vs.	ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED EX-PARTE APPLICATION FOR	
JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address	EXTENSION OF TIME WITHIN WHICH TO EFFECTUATE SERVICE	
·	ON JOHN DOE DEFENDANT	
Defendant.		
THIS CAUSE came before the Court upon Plaintiff's Amended <i>Ex-parte</i> Application		
for Extension of Time Within Which to Effectuate Service on John Doe Defendant		
("Application"), and the Court being duly advised in the premises does hereby:		
ORDER AND ADJUDGE: Plaintiff's Application is granted. Plaintiff shall have until		
November 15, 2019 to effectuate service of a summons and Complaint on Defendant.		
IT IS SO ORDERED.		
	Can Facher	
$\overline{\mathbf{U}}$	NITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
October 4, 2019		
	1	
	STRIKE 3 HOLDINGS, LLC,  Plaintiff,  vs.  JOHN DOE subscriber assigned IP address 68.224.153.164,  Defendant.  THIS CAUSE came before the Court up for Extension of Time Within Which to Effects ("Application"), and the Court being duly adviss ORDER AND ADJUDGE: Plaintiff's A November 15, 2019 to effectuate service of a start of the court of t	